



**Queensland University of Technology**  
Brisbane Australia

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted/accepted for publication in the following source:

Barth, Sharine, [Barraket, Jo](#), [Luke, Belinda G.](#), & [McLaughlin, Juliana M.](#) (2015)

Acquaintance or partner? Social economy organisations, institutional logics and regional development in Australia.

*Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 27(3-4), pp. 219-254.

This file was downloaded from: <https://eprints.qut.edu.au/87849/>

© Copyright 2015 Taylor & Francis

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development: An International Journal* on 11 Jun 2015, available online: <http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/08985626.2015.1030458>

**Notice:** *Changes introduced as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing and formatting may not be reflected in this document. For a definitive version of this work, please refer to the published source:*

<https://doi.org/10.1080/08985626.2015.1030458>

# Acquaintance or Partner? Social Economy Organisations, Institutional Logics and Regional Development in Australia

Authors' own Manuscript.

**Citation:** Barth, S., Barraket, J., Luke, B. & McLaughlin, J. (2015) Acquaintance or Partner? Social Economy Organisations, Institutional Logics and Regional Development in Australia, *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* Vol 27 (3-4), 219-254 DOI10.1080/08985626.2015.1030458

## Abstract

The social economy as a regional development actor is gaining greater attention given its purported ability to address social and environmental problems. This growth in interest is occurring within a global environment that is calling for a more holistic understanding of development compared to traditionally economic-centric conceptions. While regional development policies and practices have long considered for-profit businesses as agents for regional growth, there is a relatively limited understanding of the role of the social economy as a development actor. The institutional environment is a large determinant of all kinds of entrepreneurial activity, and therefore understanding the relationships between the social economy and broader regional development processes is warranted.

This paper moves beyond suggestions of an economic-centric focus of regional development by utilising institutional logics as a theoretical framework for understanding the role of social enterprise in regional development. A multiple case study of ten social enterprises in two regional locations in Australia suggests that social enterprise can represent competing logics to economic-centric institutional values and systems. The paper argues that dominant institutional logics can promote or constrain the inter-play between the social and the economic aspects of development, in the context of social enterprise.

Key Words: Social enterprises; social economy; institutional logics; regional development; Australia

## 1. Introduction

The limitations of a purely capitalist approach to understanding the nature of economy and society has been increasingly questioned in light of the recent global recession and shocks to the financial system (Sonnino and Griggs-Trevanthen, 2013). Regional development scholars and practitioners have also called for a more holistic understanding of development than traditionally economic-centric conceptions; one that recognises health, wellbeing, and quality of life (Pike, Rodriguez-Pose and Tomaney, 2007) as essential features of development trajectories. It has been increasingly acknowledged that the prevailing economic-centricism of regional development policies fails to account for all aspects of development. Furthermore, such an approach has been found unsuitable for ameliorating uneven development (Amin, 1998; Hudson, 2007), particularly given persistent social and economic disparities in many regions of the world. Despite repeated calls within the literature to broaden the scope of regional development to include social dimensions (Amin, 1998; Borzaga and Tortia, 2009; Pike, Rodriguez-Pose and Tomaney, 2007; Squazzoni, 2009), this has been constrained by a lack of empirical understanding regarding how the social features of

regional development co-exist and interact with dominant economic frameworks. The concept of institutional logics provides a useful framework for extending debates beyond the simple recognition of economic-centric approaches to regional development and more towards a nuanced understanding of the relationship between the social and the economic aspects of development. This is particularly pertinent in view of the growing interest in the social economy as a space in which social and economic development occurs (Amin, 2009; Hadjimichalis and Hudson, 2007).

The social economy can be defined as ‘commercial and non-commercial activity largely in the hands of the third-sector or community organisations that gives priority to meeting social and environmental needs’ (Amin, 2009 p. 47). In the context of regional development, Sonnino and Griggs-Trevarthen (2013) find that the social economy can devise endogenous models that foster resilience; yet the authors argue that the gains of these models and how they can be embedded in national and regional development strategies is still unclear. Greater rigour is needed in delineating different types of entrepreneurial activity (i.e. for-profit, social, community entrepreneurship) and whether they conflict with each other or lead to feedback loops that foster different types of regional development (Baumgartner, Putz and Seidl, 2013). We adopt institutional logics as a framework for understanding how the social economy may represent competing logics to dominant economic approaches to regional development. Institutional logics connects field level values with action at the organisational level and refers to broader cultural beliefs and rules that influence cognition and decision making (Lounsbury, 2007; Thornton, 2002). The underlying argument of an institutional logics perspective is that ‘interests, values and assumptions of individuals and organisations are embedded within prevailing institutional logics’ (Thornton and Ocasio, 2008 p. 103). Research has also found that multiple distinct logics co-exist and at times compete with each other, in the form of competing institutional logics. Competing institutional logics are present at the field level of analysis (Greenwood and Suddaby, 2006; Lounsbury, 2007), at the level of the organisation (Reay and Hinings, 2009; Saz-Carranza and Longo, 2007), as well as the individual (Pache and Santos, 2013). The argument being that rivalry is created at the introduction of a new logic because supporters of the new logic challenge incumbent actors supportive of a dominant or old logic. Competing logics can represent organisational forms, theoretical frameworks, vocabularies of practice, as well as different practices within the same organisation (Thornton, Ocasio and Lounsbury, 2012). In this research, we argue that the social economy may represent competing logics through an examination of social enterprise actors within regional development practices.

Conceptualising the role of the social economy in regional development is an underdeveloped yet promising area of research. Discussions to date have been limited to a dominant focus on the creation and use of social capital at the expense of considering how social economy organisations use and produce other forms of capital (Eversole, Barraket and Luke, 2013). This limitation suggests that further examination of the role and function of social enterprises - a subset of the social economy – as regional development actors is warranted. The hybrid nature of these organisations, which are purported to produce both social and economic capital (Galera and Borzaga, 2009; Teasdale, 2010) requires rigorous theorisation within

regional development debates. This is particularly pertinent in view of entrepreneurship being socially embedded and influenced through social and cultural processes (McKeever, Anderson and Jack, 2014). In view of this, this paper draws upon institutional logics as a lens through which to contribute to existing theory, moving beyond anecdotal evidence and more towards appropriate theorisation of social enterprises within regional development policies and practice. Hjorth (2013) argues that the notion of social entrepreneurship is dominated by a market-based approach, which underplays the importance of the social aspect. Similarly, regional development research and practice has been critiqued for its economic-centric approach (Amin, 2009). Through an examination of institutional logics we move the agenda beyond the economic perspective by identifying where social enterprise activities represent a competing logic in regional development, through the pursuit of both economic and social objectives. In doing so, we contribute to current calls for a more holistic approach to regional development, by highlighting how social enterprises operate within economic-centric approaches to regional development.

The paper extends thinking and knowledge of regional development in three ways. First, in view of the need to develop a more balanced understanding of regional development, this paper delineates the relationship between social enterprises and other regional development actors and argues that these organisational forms represent competing institutional logics to current approaches to regional development. This is based on the results of a study of the local development effects of ten social enterprises in two regional towns in Australia. Second, we highlight that the institutional environment has an influential role in either promoting or constraining social enterprise activity. This has implications for the extent to which social enterprise and other regional development actors can coexist and co-create socio-economic development. Third, this paper responds to broader demands within Entrepreneurship and Regional Development, which have clearly noted the need to operationalise the various spaces and geographical dimensions of social entrepreneurship (Chell, Nicolopoulou, Karatas-Ozkan, 2010).

The remainder of this article is structured as follows. In Section 2, we review the underpinning framework of institutional logics in the context of the social economy. Section 3 reviews the literature on the social economy in current regional development debates. The methodology and case studies involved are detailed in Section 4. Section 5 presents the research findings. Section 6 discusses these findings in view of institutional logics, the social economy and regional development. Section 7 concludes with research and policy implications.

## **2. Theoretical perspectives – Institutional logics and the social economy**

Fiedland and Alford's (1991) seminal work provided a foundation for contextualising the everyday actions of entrepreneurship. Developed within the field of neo-institutional theory (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983; Greenwood and Hinings, 1996; Scott, 2008; Suddaby, 2010), which is traditionally concerned with macro-level studies such as isomorphism and diffusion, institutional logics examines micro-institutionalisation (Greenman, 2013). This was recently articulated by Thornton, Ocasio and Lounsbury (2012) who propose

that everyday entrepreneurial actions are embedded in an inter-institutional system that consists of different institutional logics. Macro multiple institutional logics co-exist and compete with one another and include examples such as family, state and market, which results in institutional complexity (Greenwood, Oliver, and Suddaby, 2008). An institutional logics approach thus has value as a metatheoretical framework for analysing the interrelationships between different levels of analysis such as the individual, organisation and social system (Thornton et al., 2012). The core premise is that the interests, values and assumptions of individuals and organisations are embedded in prevailing institutional logics. The use of institutional logics as a means to contextualise entrepreneurship is growing. For example, at the firm level, competing logics have been used to examine hybrid organisational forms such as social enterprise (Pache and Santos, 2012). Coule and Patmore (2013) also use institutional logics as a mechanism to explain why some non-profit organisations seem to be instigators of innovation while others perpetuate existing social norms and practices. In a similar vein of inquiry, studies also examine the ability of actors to respond to institutional influences and barriers (Dacin, Goodstein, and Scott, 2002). Referred to as institutional entrepreneurs, these actors are purported to facilitate the development of new fields and practices within organisations (David, Sine and Haveman, 2013), although do not necessarily represent the main agent of change within the institutional approach.

Legitimacy is often at the core of these studies and is understood here as being ‘a generalized perception or assumption that the actions of an entity are desirable, proper, or appropriate within some socially constructed system of norms, values, beliefs and definitions’ (Suchman 1995, p. 574). Given that social enterprise is a pre-paradigmatic field that lacks a well defined normative logic (Nicholls, 2010); interest in neo-institutionalism and the overall legitimacy of social enterprise actors is growing (Dart, 2004; Hervieux, Gedajlovic and Turcotte, 2010; Luke, Barraket, Eversole, 2013; Ruebottom, 2013). Nicholls (2010) argues that the social enterprise field is undergoing a form of reflexive isomorphism whereby ‘organisations actively engage in processes that align field-level and internal logics to shape emerged institutional fields as closed systems of self-legitimation’ (p. 617). Huybrechts and Nicholls (2013) recently demonstrated this process by highlighting the importance of legitimacy of social enterprise actors in the context of social enterprise and corporate partnerships. Similarly, Di Domenico, Haugh and Tracey (2010) in their analysis of social bricolage find that persuasion of others for the business case, is a characteristic of social enterprise in order to leverage social legitimacy. Overall, it is evident that the process of addressing the legitimacy challenges faced by social enterprise is contributing to the emergence of an institutional domain characterised by a dual logic – both economic and social (Hervieux, et al. 2010). This further supports the premise of reflexive isomorphism (Nicholls, 2010), whereby social enterprises contribute to the institutional environment through interaction with different groups.

At a more macro level, another growing but underdeveloped area is the study of community logics. A community logic refers to reciprocities and a commitment to shared values and is often associated with social movements (Thornton et al., 2012). Community logics sits alongside plural institutional orders such

as professions, markets and the state which can either enhance or inhibit efforts to create a strong community logic (Marquis and Lounsbury, 2007; Marquis and Lounsbury, 2011). However, research into community logics is still in its infancy and much greater research into how community logics relate to the simultaneous influence of other institutional orders such as markets and the state is needed (Marquis and Lounsbury, 2011). This is exemplified in a study by Lounsbury, Ventresca and Hirsch (2003) who found that a community logic founded the early state of the recycling movement before it was challenged by a more hierarchical national approach which made it into a profit-making industry based on corporate and market logics. Along these lines we suggest that the social economy also reflects a form of community logic which competes with the dominant market logic approach to regional development. A market logic approach to regional development can be highlighted by economic growth as a well accepted indicator of regional development and the assumption that high competitiveness of local small and medium sized enterprises leads to regional economic competitiveness (Barkley and Dudensing, 2011; Bristow, 2005). Within regional development studies there is a limited understanding of the institutional factors that are important for the social economy (Mair, Marti and Ventresca, 2012). We argue that this is because the social economy represents competing logics to the mainstream economic approach to regional development as well as to the 'social' conceptions of the role of civil society in effecting change. We demonstrate this argument by first exploring how the social economy is positioned in mainstream regional development debates, and then proceed to explore the findings of a case study of ten social enterprises in two regional locations in Australia. The motivation for examining social enterprises in regional Australia was that while the social economy is gaining greater credence from state governments in Australia, there is scant evidence of the social economy's role and contribution within the context of regional development, particularly that of social enterprises. Unlike Canada (McCall, 2003) and some countries in Europe (Borzaga and Tortia, 2009) where there is much greater attention to the role of the social economy in regional development initiatives, the challenges that regional Australia faces have not been widely explored or documented in terms of the social economy's potential contribution. The social economy in this case involved both Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australian social enterprise and therefore a decolonising methodological approach was necessary. This involved a focus on interconnectedness and interrelatedness between people as well as re-examining theoretical and methodological approaches to research, and is further outlined in the Methods Section.

### **3. The social economy and regional development**

Similar to the diversity of the private sector in terms of organisational size and structure (including, for example, sole traders, small family business, and large global organisations), the social economy also encompasses a range of organisational forms, from small charitable organisations reliant on volunteer labour and philanthropic funding to large trading social enterprises (Hudson, 2009). Despite this heterogeneity, a unifying feature of the social economy is that all organisations engage in economic

activities in order to create social or environmental good (Sonnino, and Griggs-Trevvarthen, 2013). This diversity of organisational forms provides a range of possible subjects to examine in terms of their role in relation to regional development. One group of actors within the social economy, social enterprises, warrant particular attention given their explicit dual focus on generating social and financial value.

There are a number of social enterprise definitions in the literature, often reflecting the disparities in institutional environments within different countries (Defourny and Nyssens, 2006; Kerlin, 2006). For this reason Barraket et al.'s (2010 p. 4) definition is appropriate for this study because it is specifically relevant to the Australian context. In accordance with this definition, social enterprises are organisations that:

- *Are led by an economic, social, cultural or environmental mission consistent with a public or community benefit,*
- *Trade to fulfil their mission,*
- *Derive a substantial portion of their income from trade; and*
- *Reinvest the majority of their profit/surplus in the fulfilment of their mission.*

While the concept of social enterprise is not new, current growth in interest is attributed to a number of factors emerging over the past two decades. These include: declining state involvement in the provision of social services; technological advancements; and the global devolution and privatisation of welfare states (Bull, 2008; Dart, 2004). A number of studies suggest social enterprises make specific contributions to regional development, however, these remain largely theoretical or are based on assumptions that social enterprises will generate benefits for regional areas (Borzaga and Tortia, 2009; Mawson, 2010). The primary premise of these studies is that social enterprises may be an important instrument for place-based development, given that their resources are linked with social objectives and are embedded at the local level (Borzaga and Tortia, 2009; Smith and Stevens, 2010). Employment creation, the ability to reduce costs for the welfare system and the use of resources for a public benefit are identified in the literature as associated benefits of social enterprises for regional development (Borzaga and Tortia, 2009; Evans and Syrett, 2007). Social enterprises are also purported to generate financial as well as social capital and therefore bridge the presumed divide between the social and economic aspects of development (Borzaga and Tortia, 2009). The concept of social capital can be understood as 'those features of social organisation, such as networks, norms, and trust that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit' (Putnam, 1993 p. 2). Social capital is not only a resource, but also a process (Anderson and Jack, 2002) and interplays with other forms of capital such as economic, cultural, and symbolic capital (Lehner, 2014). Social capital is also found to have a significant positive effect on economic development within particular regions (Onyx and Leonard, 2010) and accounts for the more intangible economies or 'relational assets' (Storper, 1995).

In view of these societal benefits, governments in some world regions are focusing on the role of the social economy in mainstream development, yet empirical evidence remains limited. Hudson (2009) suggests that there are three interpretations of the social economy in relation to the mainstream economy. These include: the social economy as adjunct to the mainstream economy (a safety net for the excluded

and marginalised in society); the social economy as parallel to the mainstream economy (seeking to compete with mainstream markets); and the social economy as transformative (representing alternative definitions and meanings of economy) (see for example Cameron and Gibson-Graham, 2005; Gibson-Graham and Cameron, 2007).

The following sections of this paper examine the first two perspectives of the social economy in view of regional development. Commonly, the social economy is portrayed as adjunct to regional development policies and research, rather than a parallel actor. Hudson (2009 p. 507) explains that the parallel perspective represents the social economy as an alternative to 'the values and economic logic of mainstream capitalism but one that also accepts the mainstream and, on occasion, seeks to compete with capitalist enterprises within the markets of the mainstream'. This is consistent with the premise that social enterprises may represent a community logic that competes with the economic logic of mainstream regional development. Given that social enterprises trade and often compete with the private sector, these organisations present a research setting in which to examine whether and if so, how they exist *parallel* to mainstream regional development. Within this setting, there is a need to understand the various actors in regional development and how the social economy relates to broader regional development actors and institutions. In this paper, we consider how social enterprises are perceived in regional development, and whether they represent competing logics to mainstream regional development. We first explore this in view of the dominant economic logic in regional development that perceives the social economy as an acquaintance. We then proceed to review the limited literature that situates the social economy as a partner to regional development. Finally, we discuss our empirical findings in relation to these two perspectives.

### ***3.1 Regional development – social economy as an acquaintance***

Regional development programs are often concerned with economic perspectives such as how to create a regional environment conducive to private sector business growth and investment. Moreover, it is assumed that businesses will be attracted to regions that afford them regional/locational advantages, producing business development which is beneficial to national economic development (O'Riain, 2010). As such, regional competitiveness is of particular interest to regional geographers and economists and has come to dominate much of regional development policy and studies. This mainstream approach is reflective of the first perspective of the social economy suggested by Hudson (2009), who portrays this field of action as adjunct to the mainstream economy. The author notes that this viewpoint presents the social economy as a safety net for those that are marginalised from the mainstream and there is a clear demarcation between the roles of the social economy and the mainstream competitive environment. The social economy in this case is seen as responsible for addressing locally concentrated social exclusion and the mainstream economic environment is regarded as separate to the social economy. We suggest that this perspective represents the social economy as an acquaintance to mainstream regional development studies. It



acknowledges the social economy as a regional development stakeholder, but conceptualises the interaction and participation of the social economy in regional development activities as marginal. This perspective is reflected in most regional development research, which primarily focuses on economic imperatives, with limited concurrent mention of the social aspects of development (see for example, Moulaert and Sekia, 2003; Porter, 2000; Terluin, 2003; Tonts and Haslam-McKenzie, 2005).

While there have been debates over whether new business formation stimulates economic development (Fritsch and Mueller, 2004), the majority of regional development studies focus on private sector business development and its impact on job creation and increased economic well-being (Davidsson, Lindmark and Olofsson, 1994). Yet, while regional development is typically associated with issues of economic efficiency, it is also fundamentally linked to questions of disparities and its socio-economic effects. The study of inequalities at the regional level positions regions at the centre of policy action in many countries. As such, this warrants rigorous conceptual and empirical research in order to understand how regions can be developed not only in the sense of economic efficiency but also in terms of spatial equality and a more balanced distribution of social services and resources (Capello and Nijkamp, 2009). The limited simultaneous examination of the social economy in regional development studies means that the social economy can be described here as an acquaintance. However, there is potential for considering the social economy as a partner to regional development.

### ***3.2 Regional development – situating the social economy as a partner***

In recent years, though existing on the periphery of mainstream regional development debates, the social economy has started to receive greater attention for its potential to create regional advantage and ameliorate regional disadvantage (Borzaga and Tortia, 2009; Evans and Syrett, 2007; Sonnino, Griggs-Trevarthen, 2013; Teasdale, 2010). This is underpinned by the notion that the social economy makes valuable social and economic contributions through non-financial and financial development; and is particularly important for regional development at a time when mainstream financial collapse and uncertainty has re-emphasised the need for alternative development strategies (Sonnino and Griggs-Trevarthen, 2013). However, beyond discussions on the role of the social economy in producing and maximising social capital (Evans and Syrett, 2007; Svendsen and Svendsen, 2004), the contribution of other forms of capital to regional areas is less clear. We argue that this in part is because this field of action has largely been examined in the context of community development rather than mainstream regional development studies. Moreover, the social economy is likely to represent a form of community logic rather than economic market logic which dominates regional development studies. Herein lies the potential for exclusion of other regional development actors, such as the social economy, in the theorisation of regional development and policy objectives.

The tendency to focus solely on economic policies risks under-recognition of the iterative relationships between economic and social factors and their implications for regional development. For example, Amin

(1998) aptly notes that the popular government rhetoric on industrial upgrading and innovative cluster policy is unsuitable and is likely to be unsuccessful in regions with high unemployment levels. Hence, rather than adopting a limited focus on economic initiatives, regions need to consider incorporating a *social economy programme* in order to improve regional economic competitiveness (Amin, 1998). Yet, this is rarely addressed within regional development debates. Smith and Stevens (2010) recently highlighted the role of geography in social enterprise networks and the structural embeddedness of these organisations' actions. In a similar vein, we argue the importance of the institutional environment and the antecedents required for considering social enterprises in regional development. We suggest that an institutional logics approach can inform an understanding of how the institutional environment influences social enterprises at the organisational level. Conversely, social enterprises can represent competing logics to existing regional development approaches, influencing the institutional environment around them. Therefore, the overarching question which guided this research is: Do social enterprises represent competing logics to current regional development approaches in Australia? Informed by our conceptual approach, specific questions we sought to explore were:

1. How are social enterprises perceived in regional development?
2. How do social enterprises interact with other regional development actors?

In exploring the relationship between social enterprise and other regional developments actors, the findings from this research highlight the importance of the institutional environment surrounding social enterprise. Furthermore, by drawing upon institutional logics we highlight how social enterprises represent competing logics to economic-centric approaches to regional development. The findings incrementally build on current theorisation of social enterprise and regional development, and consider the implications for development policy and research.

#### **4. Methodology**

This paper focuses on one aspect of the findings from a larger multiple case study of two regional towns in Australia, which examined the resource needs of regional social enterprises that potentially contribute to the region. The term *region* used in this research refers to the two participating towns located in outer regional Australia. There are a number of ways to define a region, including identification of formal boundaries such as local or state government control, social connections and natural environments/landscapes (Bureau of Infrastructure, Transport and Regional Economics, 2008). Region One is one of eight towns and villages in a Local Government Area (LGA) within the State of New South Wales (NSW). Region Two is one of ten towns and villages in another State of NSW LGA. The term *regional*

adopted in this research refers to non-metropolitan areas in Australia, which is consistent with popular and political regional discourse<sup>1</sup> (Pritchard and McManus, 2000).

#### **4.1 Context**

The towns were selected based on a number of criteria including the presence of social enterprises focused on employment/training, and social enterprises delivering health services (specifically a health co-operative), as well as similar characteristics such as population and distance from a main city. The types of social enterprises selected were chosen as a focus based on the challenges that regional Australia faces in terms of outmigration, unemployment and access to affordable health care services (ABS, 2001; Beer et al., 2005). While not all regional towns in Australia face disadvantage, regionality is often a significant predictor of socio-economic disadvantage (Vinson, Rawsthorne and Cooper, 2001). The Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS), 2001 classification prescribed by the *Accessibility/Remoteness Index of Australia (ARIA+)* is the main Australian spatial indicator. This index was used to identify the remoteness of each region, which is determined in terms of physical distance from services and opportunities for social interaction. Region One is classified as *outer regional* by the ARIA+ standards. It has a population of approximately 1,000 people with approximately 40% being of Indigenous Australian heritage (ABS, 2012). Region Two is also classified as *outer regional* by the ARIA+ standards and has a population of approximately 2,000 people with approximately 50% identifying as Indigenous Australians (ABS, 2012). Despite the significant social and economic disadvantage experienced in both communities and the government programs designed to address these issues, this research uncovered a number of local social economy initiatives in each region that existed alongside private business and government activities. This paper situates these activities within the broader regional development context and considers their interaction with other regional development actors.

The merit of utilising a multiple case study approach was its ability to generate a robust and in-depth understanding of social enterprises in regional areas. This is in contrast to a single case design, which is more suited for testing a well-formulated theory (Eisenhardt, 1989). A snowball sampling technique resulted in both Indigenous and non-Indigenous social enterprises being part of the research. While incorporating Indigenous social enterprise was not part of the initial research design, and was a result of

---

<sup>1</sup> While this definition of regional has been adopted for the research, it is important to note that there are other definitions of regional which are determined by government jurisdiction, natural resources and culture and heritage. However, these definitions of regional also include metropolitan as well as non-metropolitan regions.

snowball sampling the social enterprises in the selected regions, engaging with decolonising research methodology became an inherent part of the research process<sup>2</sup>.

#### ***4.2 Research Process and Decolonising Research***

The need for an Indigenous perspective is based on the recognition that non-Indigenous research paradigms have controlled ways of knowing, often at the expense of Indigenous knowledge systems (see Foley 2003, p. 44). Failure to integrate Indigenous perspectives or integrate Indigenous ways of knowing has potential for misinterpretation and misrepresentation of individuals and communities (Milner, 2007) and reinforces colonial practices that include representations of the Indigenous 'other' (Smith, 1999, 39). Overall, Indigenous methodologies involve centring Aboriginal ways of knowing, ways of being, and ways of doing in alignment with aspects of Western qualitative research frameworks. Drawing from and extending qualitative traditions, it allows for the voice of the Indigenous 'other', informed by their own knowledge systems (Chilisa, 2012; Smith, 1999). While it is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss in detail how this research recognised and accounted for Indigenous knowledge, it is important to note a few ways in which Indigenous methodologies influenced the theoretical framework and researcher standpoint. Indigenous epistemologies cannot easily be categorically defined since knowledge is not just socially constructed but also locally situated and context specific (Battiste, 2008; Memmi, 1965; Smith, 1999). Broadly speaking, Indigenous epistemologies are about interconnectedness and interrelatedness between people, knowledge and the natural world (Martin, 2003; Walker, 2003). Regardless of research discipline, there is a growing awareness of the need to engage with methodology that seeks to alter power relations between participants and researchers (Nicholls, 2009). In this research this was achieved through engaging with and adhering to community protocols and relationship building. Interconnectedness and interrelatedness are central to Indigenous epistemologies and this guided involvement with community members and reinforced the need for a qualitative methodology. Researcher reflexivity, examining one's own personal assumptions, and declaring researcher indigeneity and standpoint was also a central part of the research process (see McLaughlin, 2011).

Indigenous methodology also influenced this research by re-examining the original overarching theoretical framework which was influenced by western frameworks, as well as reconsidering conceptions of cultural capital. For example, the concept of cultural capital is generally attributed to the work of Pierre Bourdieu (1986), which focuses on the possession of knowledge, accomplishments and qualifications of individuals (Johnson, 2006). In contrast, de Bruin (1999) draws upon Bourdieu's classification of institutionalised, objectified and embodied cultural capital in order to consider cultural capital in non-dominant groups, in this case amongst Pacific Islanders in New Zealand. Cultural capital is reconceptualised

---

<sup>2</sup> Indigenous methodologies do not entail rejecting Western theoretical frameworks or knowledge. Through the cultural interface, this research was able to reconcile alternative ways of thinking about the research process alongside Western research paradigms (Louis, 2007; Wilson, 2001).

to understand how it is shared by non-dominant groups for entrepreneurial ventures, in ways that are preferred and valued by that group (de Bruin and Dupuis, 2003). Cultural capital in this sense is not restricted to economics; rather it includes community pride, confidence and sense of place (Johnson, 2006). Constantly revisiting and challenging how these constructs are consistent or inconsistent with Indigenous knowledge was an important part of the process. De Bruin's work is a valuable step toward broadening conceptualisations of cultural capital, yet it is important to recognise that these forms of capital also exist together with non-Indigenous cultural capital in regional areas. Overall, *the cultural interface* (see Nakata, 2007), guided not only the evaluation of theoretical frameworks and constructs but also both the research structure and procedures. The cultural interface refers to the contested space between two knowledge systems, where things are not clearly Indigenous or non-Indigenous. 'In this space are histories, politics, economics, multiple and interconnected discourses, social practices and knowledge, technologies which condition how we all come to look at the world, how we come to know and understand our changing realities in the everyday, and how and what knowledge we operationalise in our daily lives' (Nakata, 2007, p. 9). While tensions between Western knowledge frameworks and Indigenous epistemologies may not be able to be fully overcome, the cultural interface provided a means through which to consider both Indigenous ways of knowing and as well as Western frameworks. It enabled consideration of where the constructs adopted for this research were suited or not within an Indigenous context. In addition to adhering to community protocols, the research was also designed to satisfy the three main ethical issues in qualitative research, namely, informed consent, right to privacy, and protection from harm (Fontana and Frey, 1998). Anonymity of the respondents and regions was protected through the coding of responses such that their identity was known only to the researcher.

#### **4.3 Sample**

The types of social enterprises that informed the sample selection were Indigenous health co-operatives and Indigenous and non-Indigenous social enterprises focused on creating local employment and training opportunities. Face-to-face interviews were conducted by the first author with the social enterprise employees, volunteers, managers and board members over a period of 12 months. Three visits were made to each region during this period, each visit varying between 1-2 weeks in order to build rapport and trust with the communities. In order to capture the perception of those involved in the region, semi-structured interviews were also held with the beneficiaries of the social enterprises, representatives of community organisations, and government representatives, both managerial and front-line staff. Each interview varied between 1-2.5 hours and produced approximately 10 single spaced pages of transcribed material per participant. The interviews focused on the participants' experience of social enterprise and their perceived role in regional development, including their interaction with other regional stakeholders. Overall, ten social enterprises participated with 55 individual interviews conducted across the various sample groups in the two regions. Fifteen participants were also part of three focus group discussions in Region Two. In total,

70 participants across both regions participated in the research (see Appendix 1 for a list of the participants and sample groups). The interview protocol remained the same across the two regions in order to enhance the trustworthiness of the research findings. However, a separate interview schedule was designed specifically for each sample group. An example of the interview protocol for two sample groups (representatives of social enterprise and representatives of government and community organisations) is provided in Appendix 2 in order to illustrate the similarities and differences across sample group questions. Focus group discussions drawing on the same interview protocols were conducted in Region Two to augment data collection from groups of employees within two social enterprises. These groups formed a more comfortable and informal setting for the participants than a one-on-one formal interview. As well as interviews and focus groups, participant observation of a community meeting in each region (such as the local Chambers of Commerce), formed part of the data collection. Document analysis of publicly available data was also used to corroborate or disconfirm findings in order to ensure trustworthiness of data by drawing upon multiple sources and developing a chain of evidence (Merriam, 1998). A brief summary of the participating social enterprises is provided in Tables 1 and 2.

**Table 1. Region One social enterprises**

| Organisation Type   | Mission   | Origin and Size  | Established |
|---|---|--|-------------|
| <b>Medical Cooperative</b>                                  | Address the unmet health and medical needs of communities through commercial medical clinics that are affordable and accessible       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Started by community member</li> <li>• Had grown to 30 full-time nurses and administration staff and 3 general medical practitioners</li> <li>• Caters for both Indigenous and Non-Indigenous members of the community</li> <li>• Self-funded business not reliant on government grant funding</li> </ul> | 2001        |
| <b>Technology Centre</b>                                    | Technology centre offering training space, photocopying and internet services in remote areas   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Started by members of the community which lobbied for a Community Technology Centre</li> <li>• Employs 2 part-time staff</li> <li>• 5-6 volunteers</li> </ul>   | 2002        |
| <b>Indigenous Employment and Training Social Enterprise</b> | Arts-led social enterprise established to encourage employment and entrepreneurialism   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Established by larger non-profit however, social enterprise direction abandoned during the data collection process</li> <li>• Employs 1 full-time manager</li> <li>• Casually employs 3 local creative artists</li> </ul>   | 2010        |
| <b>Women's community centre</b>                             | Sewing and craft social enterprise seeking to encourage connections among women   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Established by local resident</li> <li>• Employs 2 part-time staff</li> <li>• 2 volunteers</li> </ul>   | 2000        |
| <b>Youth Café Social Enterprise</b>                         | Mobile café part of Local Youth Centre trading at local markets to fund the centre  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Started by youth centre</li> <li>• Employed one part-time co-ordinator and three casual employees</li> </ul>  | 2010        |
| <b>Indigenous Employment and Training Social Enterprise</b> | <p>Conservation and land management Team</p> <p>Provides financial advice on a fee-for service basis and training room facilities</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Started by the Koorie Network Committee when they submitted a proposal for a Community Development Employment Project (CDEP)</li> <li>• Employed 2 full-time staff</li> </ul>   | mid 1990s   |

**Table 2. Region Two social enterprises**

| Organisation Type   | Mission   | Origin and Size   | Established |
|---|---|---|-------------|
| <b>Medical Cooperative</b>                                  | Provide culturally sensitive and affordable health services                                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First Aboriginal Medical Service was founded in Redfern in 1971 from donations. There are now more than 100 nationwide</li> <li>• 40% of clients are non-Aboriginal</li> <li>• Non-profit organisation reliant on public support from individuals</li> <li>• Local Aboriginal Medical Service employs 2 General Practitioners, 20+ administration and nursing staff</li> </ul>   | 1986        |
| <b>Indigenous Employment and Training Social Enterprise</b> | Goal is to improve the social fabric and living standards of residents                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peak provider of employment services to Indigenous communities in the region</li> <li>• Not-for-profit (primarily) government funded public company limited by guarantee</li> <li>• Owns two subsidiaries, one of which is a lawn mowing business that seeks to extend The Federal Government's Community Development Project (CDEP<sup>3</sup>) project</li> <li>• Lawn mowing business employs 10 full-time employees</li> </ul> | 2003        |
| <b>Elders Group</b>   | Manage Aboriginal cultural centre which provides support for Elders and leadership activities | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employs 2 part-time staff</li> <li>• Charity with small social enterprise activities to subsidise maintenance costs</li> </ul>   | 2005        |
| <b>Australian Disability Enterprise Local Café</b>          | Provides employment and training opportunities for people who have a disability               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Started by large disability service provider. The café provides employment and training opportunities for people who have a disability</li> <li>• Funded up government; and sole café in Region Two</li> <li>• Employs up to 17 people who are on the Disability Support Pension (DSP)</li> </ul>  | 2005        |

---

<sup>3</sup> CDEP is a Commonwealth Government Scheme started in 1977 and has been a feature of the Indigenous labour market in remote and regional areas. CDEP organisations were allocated funding to pay the wages of CDEP participants (Hunter and Gray, 2012). The wage was the equivalent of income support payments and had an explicit community development aim. From June 2013, CDEP ceased to exist with CDEP, Job Services Australia, Disability Employment Services and Indigenous Employment Program being integrated into a single service – Remote Jobs and Community Program (RJCP) <http://deewr.gov.au/remote-jobs-and-communities-program>

#### **4.4 Data Analysis**

All interviews and focus group discussions were recorded, transcribed, and analysed by the first author. Given the large amount of interview data, Nvivo software enabled the data to be managed more systematically. However, as this software does not extend beyond description, the analytical skills of the researcher were an imperative component of the process (Pope, Ziebland and Mays, 2000). Thematic analysis enabled themes to emerge and began with first level coding, which involved identifying and categorising primary patterns of the data. This was achieved systematically by coding the interviews in Region One and then coding for Region Two. As themes were identified in Region One within each social enterprise, the constant comparative method was used to compare observations in Region Two (Cavana, Sekaran, and Delahaye 2001). The themes that emerged within sample groups in each region were also compared across regions. Pattern coding was then applied in order to reduce the main themes and identify patterns and explanatory reasons. Identifying contradictions and recurrences across the data set provided a deeper analysis and protected against premature conclusions. Document analysis also provided opportunities for identifying inconsistencies and/or contradictions for further investigation or refinement for interpretations, thus improving the trustworthiness of the data (Padgett, 1998). Participant observation of one community meeting in each region also enabled observational data to corroborate or disconfirm themes that emerged in the interview data. A reflexive diary was also important in terms of recollecting observations made during the participant observation of community meetings, as well as general observations made during visits to each region.

Table 3 describes the two main logics in relation to regional development that guided the theoretical framework. It also outlines the key findings that emerged from the analysis and where they fit in relation to the two logics. The second column highlights the theoretical foundations of each perspective of development, which were chosen for the purpose of this research. The focus of either a market-based or community-based logic for regional development is highlighted in column three. The fourth column notes where the findings from this research converge or diverge in relation to the two institutional logics, for example, where SE ‘fits’ within market-based logic and where it fails to gain legitimacy according to this logic. Where R1 is specified, this finding was only relevant to this region. Where it is not noted, the finding was common in both regions. The fifth column denotes where the findings converge and represent a dual logic in terms of regional development, in particular, where social enterprise challenged or co-existed within a market-logic approach. These themes emerged from the data analysis and have not received express consideration within regional development literature to date. The findings in relation to how SE are perceived and how they interact with other regional development actors is discussed in more detail below.



**Table 3. Theoretical underpinnings and summary of research findings**

| Institutional logics in relation to regional development   | Theoretical underpinnings   | Focus at a regional level  | Social enterprise in practice - org/sector level findings                                       | Suggestions of a dual logic | Implications for regional development  |
|--|---|--|---|-----------------------------|--|
| <b>Market-Based Logic (Dominant logic)</b><br><i>High competitiveness of local small and medium sized enterprises leads to regional economic competitiveness</i><br><br><i>Assumption that growth will occur through market based activities</i><br><br>(See: Moulaert and Sekia, 2003; Porter, 2000; Terluin, 2003; Tonts and Haslam-McKenzie, 2005). | <b>Economic Development</b><br>The ability of each region to produce goods and services with a competitive advantage in order to compete nationally and internationally (Terluin, 2003).  | - Firm growth<br>- Increased employment in the region<br>- Increased competitiveness of the region                 | - Perceived subsidised competition (R1)   | ✓                           | - Lack of legitimacy as economic actors among other regional development actors<br>- Contributors of economic capital  |
|  |   |  | - Competitive awareness among private businesses (R1)   | ✓                           |  |
|  |   |  | - SE producers of economic capital through the retention of economic flows and local employment |                             |  |
|  |   |  | - Lack of financial viability   |                             |  |
|  |   |  | - Presence of Institutional social entrepreneurs (R1)   | ✓                           |  |
| Institutional logics in relation to regional development   | Theoretical underpinnings   | Focus at a regional level  | Social enterprise in practice - org/sector level findings                                       | Suggestions of dual logic   | Implications for regional development  |
| <b>Community-Based Logic (Competing logic)</b><br><i>Reciprocities and a commitment to shared values often associated with social movements</i><br><br>(See: Amin, 1998; de Bruin, 1999; Evers and Schulze-Boeing, 2001; Onyx and Leonard, 2010).  | <b>Social and Cultural Development</b><br>Social capital, being resources embedded in social networks accessed and use by actors for actions (Lin et al. 2001, p. 25).<br><br>Cultural Capital <sup>4</sup> , 'being a community's cultural skills and values, in all their community-defined forms, and desired by the community to be passed on to its next generation' (Dalziel et al. 2009, p. 35). It includes community pride, confidence and a sense of place (Johnson, 2006). | - Increased social capital<br>- Maintaining cultural capital<br>- Building community pride, confidence and harmony | - SE producers of social capital  |                             | - Strong legitimacy as social actors among other regional development actors<br>- Contributors of cultural and social capital through the health service and social services |
|  |   |  | - SE producers of cultural capital  |                             |  |
|  |   |  | - Resource sharing and collaboration among private business and SE (R1)                         | ✓                           |  |

✓ = dual logic occurring in terms of SE challenging or co-existing with the market-based logic.

<sup>4</sup>In contrast to Bourdieu's classification of cultural capital, de Bruin (1999) shifts the focus away from how a lack of dominant cultural capital can disadvantage groups, and more towards how cultural capital of non-dominant groups can be shared and utilised, especially in the context of community entrepreneurship. The adopted definitions of cultural capital reflect this shift in focus (see also de Bruin and Dupuis, 2003).

## 5. Findings – The institutional environment and social enterprises

By contrasting the findings from two regions, this research identified differences in the institutional environment that either provided opportunities or constrained social enterprises in being part of regional development processes. Social enterprises in Region One had greater interaction with regional development stakeholders (e.g. government agencies, local business owners and local government). However this was not the experience in Region Two. In Region One this was demonstrated by a greater awareness of social enterprise in the region as well as competition between social enterprises and private for-profit businesses. Moreover, collaboration between social enterprises in Region One was more evident than in Region Two. For example, the following comment illustrates a situation where a social enterprise exchanged skills for physical working space in order to deal with resource scarcity.

*We don't have the money for rent or anything... They say that if I teach their kids for a day they will give the space to us free of rent. We are just working on a barter system at the moment (Beneficiary 1, SE E).*

In contrast to collaboration and resource sharing, a common issue raised by social enterprise participants in Region Two was the lack of collaboration, as is evident in this quote by a social enterprise manager.

*I think that everyone in [this area] sticks to themselves. I don't think that there is a business in town that would help you. If you were out of something...I just think that they are all stuck in their own individual businesses and they don't see it as a whole community (Manager 1, SE B).*

Hence, the two regions had varying degrees to which they collaborated and competed with one another, impacting on the extent to which social enterprises formed part of regional development plans and processes.

### 5.1 Organisational legitimacy and subsidised competition

A common theme across both regions was the issue of organisational legitimacy. While the majority of participants (both within the social enterprises, and within the wider community) were able to cite social and cultural benefits of the social enterprises for the region, it was uncommon for the financial benefits (or liabilities) to be readily noted. The social benefits of social enterprise for the region are exemplified in the following comments.

*We were lucky. If we didn't have the [lawn mowing enterprise] here we'd be drunk just walking around doing nothing (Focus Group 1, SE B).*

Another participant in Region Two more strongly noted that without the medical social enterprise, the community would suffer.

*Oh yeah for sure, the medical service. If the medical service wasn't there I am sure that this community would be buggered (Employee 1, SE A).*

In both regions the majority of participants were clear in expressing the social benefits of the social enterprises. An example of social enterprise contributing to cultural capital and harmony is expressed in the following comment by a local business owner in Region Two:

*So many cultural differences in the Anglo-Saxon population and the Indigenous population, such a different belief and health system, such a cultural divide. I think it is terrific and that is where it is so positive I pat ourselves on the back for encouraging and trying to improve the harmony in the town (Representative of Local Business 1).*

Yet, while the majority of respondents considered social enterprises to be providers of essential social and health services, they were less clear about how the organisations in question contributed financially to economic activity in their regions. Most participants across all sample groups, including the social enterprises, were unable to clearly articulate the financial benefits of the social enterprise activities for the region. Despite this, comments such as the following, suggest that social enterprise do make a financial contribution to the region. However, this was not as explicit in the participants' responses in comparison to social and cultural benefits.

*Number one it is helping the job seekers with personal finance as well as stimulating the community's economy by putting money back into the community which is then constantly fed back in (Representative of Government Organisation 2).*

Overall, financial benefits of social enterprise were more subtly expressed by participants and this is likely due to the fact that the social enterprise are perceived to fit within a community logic which may not be congruent with conceptions of a market logic. Alternatively, some social enterprises were shifting towards a business model after operating as a government social service provider for many years. This may have hindered the ability for these organisations to be perceived as commercially viable operations with sustainable economic contributions for the region. The social enterprises that were formed as a business from inception may not have experienced the same level of questioning regarding financial sustainability. However, describing these nuances in terms of business lifecycle is beyond the scope of this paper and is a noteworthy area for further investigation.

A lack of legitimacy was a significant barrier in both regions in terms of social enterprises communicating their organisational value to other regional stakeholders. Despite participants across sample groups primarily viewing social enterprise as contributors of social and cultural capital, it was evident during researcher visits to the region, indirect economic benefits such as employment creation and the retention of economic flows within the local economy emerged as a significant economic contribution deserving greater recognition. The following comment by a long-time resident of Region

One highlights the growth in the social economy within the region which created employment and retained culturally appropriate medical services within the community.

*There wasn't anyone working at [Social Enterprise A] five years ago, there was only one person working in the Aboriginal health service across the road, the organisation where I now work. It started 21 years ago with a...part-time worker and now it is a \$4.5 million organisation. Not a lot of industries can talk about that growth in this part of the world (Community Organisation Representative 3).*

These common findings across both regions suggest that these organisations were viewed by both internal and external stakeholders as legitimate community and social organisations, but not as commercially viable businesses. This is despite the fact that organisations such as the one referred to in the above comment, were in fact commercially viable and expanding in the area. This is best described by an example in Region One where a community member expressed the struggle for the social enterprise to gain recognition as a legitimate business and a financial contributor to their region.

*Even with the confidence that we have been able to pull off, being taken seriously by the broader community, particularly industry, is challenging; external industry is challenging (Representative of Community Organisation 3).*

*You know it is funny, I was talking to people the other day and the worst thing about social enterprise is that it is called social enterprise (laughs). Having the word social in it, people just think it is this pretend fake, **half baked thing** that doesn't really require a huge skill set to organise (Representative of Community Organisation 2).*

These reflections suggest consistency between social enterprise and community logic as the organisations struggle to gain legitimacy as commercially viable organisations and therefore to 'fit' the market logic which generally characterises regional development. Further, the representatives from social enterprise and community organisations generally perceived the private for-profit sector to be receiving greater attention from government agencies, and it was typically articulated that non-profits and social enterprise representatives had a limited voice in regional development discussions. The majority of the regional development meeting members were from private business and were therefore primarily concerned with private sector issues:

*They are all very narrow, they have blinkers on, the only industries that are **real** are manufacturing and trade and they've got the big blokes in front of them (Representative of Community Organisation 3).*

Further reiterating this lack of organisational legitimacy were the concerns expressed by local private business owners in Region One. Three of the private small businesses that were in the same industry as some of the social enterprises (hospitality), were not supportive of their activities.

*It got right up my nose when one community organisation asked for some money from the Chamber of Commerce ...Another thing that annoyed me is that group of people talked about what funding was available for them, not me because I'm private. This is not a Chamber of Commerce. They are not businesses; they haven't got to make money like us. If we don't make*

*money, we go broke, we lose our home. They don't have to worry about that. If they make money, they don't get the [government/grant] funding* (Representative of Local Business 2).

Another small business in Region One similarly expressed frustration with social enterprises suggesting that these businesses were not seen as legitimate economic actors. When asked about social enterprises and their involvement in the region, she expressed that having to compete with local social enterprises was unfair given that they were perceived to be able to attract grant funding to assist them in their activities while private for-profit businesses were not entitled to such benefits from local government or funding agencies.

*They have got their government money to buy table and chairs and the coffee machine, to put the carpet down. They have volunteers that work for them. We can't compete with that. We just can't compete with it...But they don't need to make money, they don't have to worry about paying the loan* (Representative of Local Business 1).

This negative sentiment towards social enterprises from local private enterprises in the same industry was a strong theme in Region One and may be attributed in part to the clear awareness of social enterprise in the community by other regional stakeholders. The sentiment of social enterprises as subsidised competition did not present as a theme in Region Two, primarily because the region did not have a local Chamber of Commerce and there was very little interaction or competition between private sector businesses and the social enterprises. Overall, when compared to Region Two, Region One respondents provided a stronger narrative of the social enterprises contributing to and influencing the institutional environment. While this was perceived to be a primarily negative influence from the perspective of the private sector small businesses in Region One, the findings suggest that the social economy in Region One was active in regional development discussions and interacted with different institutional actors within the region.

The greater evidence of social enterprise activity in Region One appears to be attributable in large part to the presence of institutional social entrepreneurs, who helped to confer legitimacy on social enterprises by raising awareness of these organisational forms. Institutional social entrepreneurs were not overtly evident in Region Two given the lack of inter-sector collaboration as evidenced by the interviews with regional stakeholders and participant observation of community meetings.

## **5.2 Institutional social entrepreneurs**

The effect of institutional social entrepreneurs on social enterprise involvement in regional development was a finding unique to Region One, where these individuals were active in developing social enterprise activity in the community. This form of leadership was evident in many interviews with community stakeholders, who often referred by name to one particular member in the region, active in social enterprise development. It was clear that this individual was able to harness support

for the sector and was central in networking with government organisations (e.g. Regional Development Australia (RDA)<sup>5</sup>) and other regional institutions (e.g. local technical colleges). Other institutional entrepreneurs included the manager of the local neighbourhood centre and the manager of RDA for Region One. While these key institutional entrepreneurs did not have full-time paid positions to develop social enterprises, their interest in social enterprises aligned with their line of work and arguably influenced institutional arrangements in the community.

The presence of institutional social entrepreneurs may have resulted in a more developed regional strategy for social enterprises in Region One compared to Region Two. During an interview with a key institutional social entrepreneur, plans to create an industry cluster were discussed, including how smaller social enterprises could collaborate to compete against the larger non-profits in the area. Given that the larger non-profits were perceived to have greater capacity to compete as job-service providers and gain contracts from government, the rationale behind the idea was to create a non-profit cluster design similar to those in for-profit industries. This was perceived to be beneficial for the small social enterprises to be able to compete against the larger non-profits; and beneficial for the social economy as a whole in order to raise the profile of their activities. While these plans were in their infancy at the time of data collection, the occurrence of these discussions illustrates that the presence of institutional entrepreneurs had the potential to support the social enterprise sector by building linkages and networks in the community.

This was not evident in Region Two, where a common theme amongst organisations was a lack of collaboration and interaction between businesses and business sectors of the community. In contrast, a direct outcome of institutional entrepreneurship in Region One was the facilitation of a conference in 2011 for local social enterprises. The purpose of the conference was to build connections between social enterprises and local community stakeholders and it was initiated by institutional entrepreneurs with the rationale of creating a non-profit cluster. This intention is best reflected in one respondent's comments with regards to competition with large non-profits:

*You get the cluster concept. Well they [large non-profits] have capacity to win. They have a team of grant writers...a whole team to write grants...well maybe if we cooperated we could do that? Hence the conference (Representative of Community Organisation 1).*

Collaborations between local government and the social enterprises were also attributed to the presence of institutional social entrepreneurship. The regional business development manager had a personal interest in social enterprise and as such, initiated a project in Region One whereby council

---

<sup>5</sup> Regional Development Australia (RDA) agencies were established in 2001 by the Federal Government in all states and territories in order to co-ordinate all levels of government, business and community groups to support the development of Australia's regions.

hired the local social enterprise's buses while they sat idle during school hours to transport tourists and promote the region's attractions.

While social enterprise activity in Region One was a contentious issue for some of the local private businesses, the tensions demonstrate that social enterprises participated in and influenced institutional arrangements. The need to have representation across both private industry and the non-profit sector is best illustrated in the following statement by an institutional entrepreneur in Region One:

*My stuff is formed by a really interesting dichotomous experience. I work in the NGO welfare sector and my extra-curricular activities have been in regional economic development. There aren't a lot of people I know who work in those two spaces (Representatives of Community Organisation 3).*

Institutional social entrepreneurs recognising the importance of working across sectors was unique to Region One and may have attracted more social enterprise funding to the region. From an analysis of publicly available documents and regional plans, there was generally greater interest and philanthropic investment in social enterprises in Region One compared to Region Two.

### **5.3 Regional development processes**

With respect to regional development processes, there was a significant contrast in the ways in which local council and the social enterprises engaged with each other. In Region One, there was greater interaction between local council and the social enterprises. However, this was not so in Region Two with consensus among all social enterprise participants, particularly managers, that the legitimacy of their organisations was not recognised by local government. Despite some reported good relationships with council (local government), most participants described a negative and unsupportive relationship with council. This was particularly demonstrated when one social enterprise manager recounted how council was proposing a change in the town that was already being undertaken by the social enterprises. For example, one social enterprise developed a cultural space in the community; however there had been proposals by local government to develop another cultural centre. The social enterprise manager felt that this proposal undermined the value of their enterprise and that greater achievements could occur if council were aware of what the social enterprise had developed and supported their organisation.

*But we clash with them sometimes too; council had talked about setting up an Aboriginal cultural centre in [Region Two], but instead of coming to talk with the Elders about it 'how can we support you to do that'...that is not how council has approached it at all...it has actually seemed like a threat to this organisation. Council would be taking away the role that this organisation has by doing it and not really bothering (Manager 1, SE D).*

Similarly, the lawn mowing social enterprise expressed the same concern regarding their relationship with council. The participants of this enterprise suggested that, rather than council contracting external lawn mowing companies for maintenance services, council should contract out to their social enterprise. Interviews with council staff illustrated that they were also unaware of the lawn mowing enterprise. This was a source of contention for the lawn mowing enterprise participants, who felt devalued.

*They have been getting [private company] to come into town and lop all the trees...here we have people doing their chainsaw training...Why are they sending [private company] in to spend a lot of money? Why is the Shire doing that? You have to keep the money here*  
(Employee 3, SE B).

This finding is in contrast to the collaborative relationships between social enterprises, local council and RDA in Region One, where social enterprises were involved with local council and RDA and formed part of broader regional development plans and activities. With the exception of the health co-operative, the social enterprises in Region Two had very few interactions with other regional stakeholders such as local council, RDA and other local businesses. In discussions with the various stakeholders in the region, including the social enterprise managers, social enterprises were not part of regional development plans and there were very limited interactions between the social enterprises and other organisations.

## **6. Discussion**

This paper extends suggestions of an economic-centric focus of regional development by utilising institutional logics as a theoretical framework for understanding the role of social enterprise in regional development. In answering our overarching research question - 'Do social enterprises represent competing logics to current regional development approaches in Australia?' we find that these organisations represent a form of competing logic as they did not 'fit' within mainstream regional development policy and often struggled to establish legitimacy with other regional development actors. Nonetheless, while social enterprise represents competing logics to mainstream regional development, social enterprises in our sample were found to be active in regional Australia and addressing social and economic issues in their regions through the provision of health services and the retention of local employees and economic flows in the region. However, our research finds that understanding the institutional environment and the dominant logic in regional development is central for further understanding social enterprise as potential development actors.

The differences in collaborative relationships between the social enterprises and other regional development actors in Regions One and Two provide empirical evidence for the research sub-questions: (1) How are social enterprises perceived in regional development? (2) How do social enterprises interact with other regional development actors? The perspective of the social economy as



an *acquaintance* whereby there was very little interaction between social enterprises and other regional development actors is reflected in Region Two. This functioned as an institutional barrier, constraining social enterprises' involvement in regional development activities. In contrast, the relational dynamics in Region One reflect an experience in which social enterprises were constructed as potential *partners* in regional development. The greater interactions, and at times conflict, between social enterprises and other regional development actors such as private sector local business was markedly different to the situation reported in Region Two. The following section discusses the findings in view of the perspective of the social economy as an acquaintance or partner and what this means for understanding social enterprise as embodying competing logics within economic-centric views of regional development.

### ***6.1 Social economy as acquaintance in regional development***

Social enterprises in Region Two were largely uninvolved or not actively seeking engagement with other regional development actors. While social enterprises were acknowledged and recognised by other regional stakeholders there were very few interactions and collaborations between the different sectors. It was evident in Region Two, particularly for the lawn mowing enterprise that they had not gained legitimacy with local council. This finding is consistent with the growing literature that acknowledges the challenge of legitimacy formation for social enterprises and how they are fundamentally shaped by institutional forces (Desa, 2011; Mason, Kirkbride and Bryde, 2007; Nicholls, 2010). This lack of organisational legitimacy may be ascribed to the fact that social enterprise in Region Two were not seen as financially viable organisations and therefore lacked organisational legitimacy as commercial entities with other regional stakeholders. However, this finding was not limited to Region Two and also emerged in relation to others' constructions of social enterprises in Region One.

Given that the majority of interview respondents, including social enterprise participants, found articulating the financial contributions of these organisations to the region difficult, it is unsurprising that social enterprises lacked organisational legitimacy amongst other regional stakeholders. A general lack of organisational legitimacy in both regions represents an institutional barrier faced by social enterprises, particularly as they seek to participate in commercial markets and be considered as potential financial and social contributors to a region. Mawson (2010) found that conservative regional business networks excluded the voice of social enterprises from the overall regional strategy and programs. Similarly, this research finds that the institutional context is an important contributor to or inhibitor of social enterprise activities. This is in line with the findings from Sonnino and Griggs-Trevarthen (2013) such that institutional barriers kept UK food social enterprises out of the mainstream food sector. In the case of Region Two, the limited inter-firm relationships identified is an example of a regional institutional environment that embodies the social economy as an acquaintance.

## **6.2 Social economy as partner in regional development**

In contrast, Region One findings illustrate the potential for social enterprises to be engaged with other regional development actors despite also experiencing challenges to gaining organisational legitimacy. It was clear from both regions that social enterprises operate within an institutional framework that favours private-sector for-profit approaches to regional development. However, the experiences presented in Region One highlight the possibilities of inter-sector collaboration and the creation of an institutional environment that views the social economy as a partner in regional development. This was demonstrated by greater inter-firm collaborations as well as formative discussions to create a social enterprise cluster in order to leverage existing resources and compete with larger enterprises. Klein, Tremblay and Bussieres' (2010) study in Montreal similarly describes a social economy cluster in the fashion industry that was citizen-initiated. The cluster's ties with both social and economic actors in the region resulted in the social economy acting as an intermediary in developing social innovation. The social enterprises in Region One were clearly seeking to influence the institutional environment by creating collaborations and networks within the region. Yet, the discussions were nascent, and the social economy was not part of the socio-economic development strategies supported by government, which is a unique feature of the Canadian experience (Klein, Fontan and Tremblay, 2009). Nonetheless, findings from Region One depicted the potential for the social economy to partner with broader regional development actors through the use of networks and collaborations. This is consistent with the institutional argument that organisational success not only depends on the economic health of the organisation, but also the perceived legitimacy and appropriateness of its ideas and practices (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983).

The presence of institutional social entrepreneurs was one difference between our case study regions' findings, suggesting that the functions of these individual actors deserve greater attention when considering social enterprises in regional development. While not defined specifically within the context of social enterprise, institutional entrepreneurs are 'socially skilled actors who work to justify and legitimate new kinds of social arrangements' (David et al. 2013, p.358). They theorise the social change they wish to effect and encourage collective action to overcome resistance from those who prefer the status quo (Rao, Morrill and Zald, 2000). We find that institutional social entrepreneurs in Region One demonstrate similar qualities as evidenced by the fact that they sought to develop a social economy cluster to compete for local development grants in the region.

The value of institutional social entrepreneurs in effecting action is also similar to the case study findings of co-operatives in Sweden where *key persons* acted as community entrepreneurs (Lorendahl, 1996). As a result, Lorendahl (1996) suggests that government could invest in such key persons in order to develop the sector. While these findings highlight the impacts of the individual, collectively the social enterprises in Region One were able to influence regional development through their inter-firm relationships across the different sectors. Meyskens et al. (2010) also found that social

ventures use social engagement networks to acquire resource capital. In line with this, we find that inter-firm collaboration in Region One not only assisted with gaining access to limited resources, it also assisted in influencing institutional structures and decision-making by engaging other regional development actors such as the example in Region One where the social enterprise collaborated with local council to provide buses for local tourism.

One way institutional entrepreneurs legitimise their social innovations is by creating affiliations with institutions and actors outside of their focal field (David et al., 2013). Inter-firm relationships were valuable for many of the social enterprises in Region One and were an important source of capital that supported firm activities. By engagement with other regional stakeholders, the social enterprises were able to build constructive inter-firm relationships and positive social capital within the region. This is consistent with Barraket and Archer's (2009) Australian study, which highlights that, in some cases, social enterprises can facilitate *joined up governance* (Craig, 2003; Keast, 2011; Rhodes, 2007) between local government and community organisations. Our research gives further support to the notion that social enterprises can contribute to the institutional environment within a region by encouraging interaction between different groups. This is also consistent with the premise of reflexive isomorphism as described by Nicholls (2010) and lends further support to the suggestion that the social enterprise domain is characterised by a dual logic – both economic and social (Hervieux, et al. 2010).

However, our findings from Region One highlight that social enterprises can also create tensions in a region and that the resentment towards social enterprises from local private sector for-profit businesses in relation to perceptions of subsidised competition is noteworthy. The perception that social enterprises represent unfair competition is a barrier that social enterprises may have to overcome in order to gain acceptance as financial contributors to a region. Indeed, while social enterprises may be subsidised competition in some cases, the potential to address social needs and subsequently create skilled labour in the region for private enterprise as well as attracting other business to the area are positive implications associated with social enterprise. This is an important finding that deserves greater attention as current empirical literature on the indirect employment benefits of social enterprises in regional areas is limited. The tensions surrounding the perceived identity of social enterprise as subsidised competition, demonstrates the importance of understanding dominant and competing institutional logics in regional development.

### ***6.3 Institutional logics and socio-economic regional development***

Hudson's (2009) analytical lens provided a useful means through which to understand the different perspectives of the social economy in regional development. Social enterprises can create competition between the mainstream and alternatives to the mainstream because of their focus on the social and the economic (Hudson, 2009). We have discussed the research findings in relation to the perspective

of the social economy as an acquaintance and the social economy as a partner. We now consider these case findings in view of institutional logics and how social enterprises may represent competing logics to current approaches to regional development in Australia.

Greenman (2013 p. 646) suggests that how 'institutional logics can influence organisational design and development in particular communities or populations' is a worthwhile line of inquiry. This is explored to some extent by Vurro, Dacin and Perrini (2010) in their examination of market versus policy orientation. They find that institutional logics explain the types of conditions that need to be satisfied in order for cross-sector social partnerships to be considered appropriate. We argue that social enterprise operating within the context of regional development contributes to this discussion by illuminating how these organisational forms represent competing logics and what this means for these organisations as potential regional development actors. The social economy has been recognised as a regional development actor (Amin, 1998; Borzaga and Tortia, 2009; Mawson, 2010) and our findings confirm the veracity of this. However, we argue that explicating how the social economy operates within wider regional development processes is also important because 'how the social economy is conceptualised in relation to the rest of the economy will have a direct bearing on what is expected from it' (Amin, 2009, p. 10). Hence, our research sought to gain the perspectives of a wide range of regional stakeholders on social enterprise in regional development. In view of this, we find that social enterprise challenges dominant economic-centric conceptions of regional development as they represent a form of competing institutional logics. This is demonstrated by the lack of legitimacy afforded to social enterprise by other regional development actors.

Social enterprises may have the potential to create systems change through dialectic and relational processes because of the focus on social and economic value. Dorado and Ventresca (2013, p. 70) refer to this as - 'the simultaneous unbuilding and rebuilding of constellations of value creating activities'. However, how these organisational forms stimulate systems change and what value (if any) they do create, requires greater scrutiny. We suggest that systems change may be a result of interactions between development actors, as is demonstrated in the findings related to Region One in our study. The interaction in Region One between social enterprises and other regional development actors, created tensions as they were perceived as subsidised competition. However, this tension also represents a possibility for systems change as described by Dorado and Ventresca (2013) in terms broadening the market institutional logic to also include community logic. Greenman (2013) importantly highlights the effects of multiple and contradictory institutional logics on entrepreneurial actions. Hypothetically, a policy may seek to promote community logic through cohesion and collaboration as well as increase wealth and job creation. Greenman (2013) argues that in this case, conflict between the logic of community and the market logic should be anticipated when multiple institutional logics exist. Our findings similarly show that the everyday entrepreneurial actions of social enterprise are in line with a community logic which at times creates conflict with the dominant market

logic of regional development as in the case of social enterprises being perceived as subsidised competition.

The field of regional development has been traditionally structured around economic-centric policies and practices (Moulaert and Mehmood, 2010); we argue that social enterprises represent a competing institutional logic that may encourage relationships with more diverse development actors. This was evident in our case findings of social institutional entrepreneurs and is consistent with McCarthy (2012), who examined the impact of social entrepreneurs in Ireland on the emergence of a new institutional field, namely cultural tourism. She found that local actors, particularly social entrepreneurs influenced government policy and the creation of cultural tourism. Our findings suggest that, in some contexts, social enterprises also have the ability to reshape regional development. New institutional fields are not developed in a vacuum; rather, 'they evolve as actors work to overcome the limitations of existing fields through innovative concepts and patterns of interaction bringing with them the discourse of other arenas' (Lawrence and Nelson, 2004 p. 692). This was evident in the case of institutional social entrepreneurs in Region One who traversed the private and non-profit sectors in order to establish legitimacy of their activities with other regional stakeholders. The finding also lends further support to the argument that social enterprise actors are shaping institutional change by legitimising the dual logic of social enterprise, thus highlighting the discursive nature of the institutional approach (Hervieux, et al., 2010).

This paper demonstrates that social enterprise represents a form of competing logics to regional development in Australia. This is based on the findings of how other regional stakeholders perceive social enterprise activities as well as how they interact with each other. However, the findings are limited to case studies of two regions in Australia, and future research can extend these findings by examining different contexts and social enterprises in different industries in order to explore the insights from this study in other regions. Particular avenues for more detailed examination include the perception of social enterprise as subsidised competition, limited organisational legitimacy of social enterprises, as well as institutional social entrepreneurs and their role in traversing public and private spheres. The use of stakeholder theory may provide further detailed explanations into the various relationships between social enterprise and other regional development actors. These insights can provide regional development policy and research greater direction into the necessary antecedents of how the social economy can transition from acquaintance to partner in regional development. To date, the relationship between social entrepreneurship and institutional change has received limited attention (McCarthy, 2012). Given that social enterprise may embody competing logics in the context of regional development; this may open greater opportunities for examining social entrepreneurship and institutional change and extending knowledge in this area. By analysing the various ways in which entrepreneurship relates to society as well as the broader institutional environment, we may create new possibilities for entrepreneurship practices (Hjorth, 2013). While this paper focused on regional

development, examining social enterprise in other institutional contexts is a noteworthy line of enquiry, particularly in an era of collaboration between government and non-government sectors in addressing complex societal problems (Keast and Mandell, 2014).

## **7. Conclusions**

This paper responds to recent calls to move beyond economic-centric conceptualisations of regional development, and more broadly, to understand the role and potential shortcomings of regional institutional arrangements (Rodriguez-Pose, 2013). Through adopting an institutional perspective (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983; Greenwood, 2013; Suddaby, 2010), our findings extend conversations around how social enterprises interact with their institutional environment (Ney, Beckman, Graebnitz, and Mirkovic, 2014). Theoretically, in demonstrating the salience of institutional logics to understanding social enterprise in regional development, we provide a platform for future research to uncover in more detail how institutional logics shape regional development actions. Creating a greater empirical base embedded in existing theory will move towards a more rigorous theorisation of social enterprise within regional development. Moreover, while its importance is only briefly discussed here, future research involving Indigenous communities must also engage with decolonising methodology in order to conduct respectful and ethical research as well as provide a more accurate understanding of social enterprise actors to acknowledge alternative and regional based realities. This paper briefly highlights the importance of understanding the complexities of the different epistemologies and ways of knowing that directly impact on social enterprises in Australia. Social enterprises by no means represent the cure for all social and economic ills in regions. However, we suggest that the relationship between social economy organisations and other development actors is a worthwhile line of inquiry if regional development research and policy is to understand and account for the full spectrum of development actors and their contributions to socio-economic regional development. In practice, social enterprise perceived as subsidised competition has implications for regional development and social enterprise policy. This may involve regional education around what social enterprises entail, what they are being subsidised for, and the associated productivity benefits and costs. The potential to create skilled labour for private enterprises as well as attracting other businesses to the area are positive implications associated with social enterprise. This finding warrants greater examination as the evidence of indirect employment benefits of social enterprise in regional areas remains limited. In addition, social enterprises are to be aware of the legitimisation process in the context of regional development. Avenues to overcome legitimacy barriers include engaging in inter-sector collaboration and the importance of institutional social entrepreneurs. Moving forward, future research is needed in order to build current theorisation of social enterprise in regional development, a nascent area of enquiry. We argue that institutional logics can be used as a lens through which to examine and explain the interactions between regional stakeholders and social enterprises. In doing so, a more nuanced

account of the social economy as acquaintance or partner in regional development will be achieved through understanding the influence of institutional logics on everyday entrepreneurial actions.

## References

- Amin, Ash. 1998. An Institutional Perspective on Regional Economic Development. In *Economic Geography Research Group Seminar* London: Department of Geography.
- Amin, Ash. 2009. "The Social Economy International Perspectives on Economic Solidarity." In. Online Book Zed Books
- Anderson, Alistair, and Jack, Sarah. 2002. "The articulation of social capital in entrepreneurial networks: a glue or a lubricant". *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* no. 14(3): 193-210.
- Australian, Bureau, Of, Statistics. 2001. Information Paper ABS Views on Remoteness Canberra Australian Bureau of Statistics.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics. 2012. Australian Demographic Statistics (Vol. 3101.0). Canberra: Australian Bureau of Statistics.
- Barraket, Jo , and Verity Archer. 2009. Changing the Rules in Use? An Examination of Social Enterprise in Local Governance In *Social Innovation Research Conference: Social Innovation: Reconfiguring Markets, Blurring Sector Boundaries and Challenging Institutional Arrangements* Oxford University Oxford
- Barraket, Jo, Nick Collyer, Matt O'Connor, and Heather Anderson. 2010. Finding Australia's Social Enterprise Sector: Final Report Australian Centre for Philanthropy and Nonprofit Studies.
- Barkley, David L., Rebekka M. Dudensing. 2011. "Industrial Legacy Matters: Implications for the Development and Use of Indices of Regional Competitiveness". *Economic Development Quarterly* no. 25 (2): 130-142.
- Battiste, Marie. 2008. Research Ethics for Protecting Indigenous Knowledge and Heritage: Institutional and Researcher Responsibilities In N. K. Denzin, Y. S. Lincoln & L. Smith (Eds.), *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- Baumgartner, Daniel., Marco Putz., and Irmi Seidl. 2013. "What Kind of Entrepreneurship Drives Regional Development in European Non-Core Regions? A Literature Review on Empirical Entrepreneurship Research". *European Planning Studies* no. 21 (8): 1095-1127.
- Beer, Andrew , Terry Clower, Graham Haughtow, and Alaric Maude. 2005. "Neoliberalism and Institutions for Regional Development in Australia". *Geographical Research* no. 43 (1):49-58
- Borzaga, Carlo, and Ermanno Tortia. 2009. "Social Enterprises and Local Economic Development." In *The Changing Boundaries of Social Enterprises*, edited by Antonella Noya. E-book: OECD.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1986. The Forms of Capital In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. Westport: Greenwood Press
- Bristow, Gillian. 2005. "Everyone's a Winner: Problematising the Discourse of Regional Competitiveness". *Journal of Economic Geography* no. 38:1001-1014.
- Bull, Michael. 2008. "Challenging Tensions: Critical, Theoretical and Empirical Perspectives on Social Enterprise". *Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research* no. 14 (5):268-275
- Bureau of Infrastructure Transport and Regional Economics. 2008. *About Australia's Regions*. In Department of Infrastructure Transport Regional Development and Local Government (Ed). Canberra Bureau of Infrastructure Transport and Regional Economics.
- Cameron, Jenny, and J K Gibson-Graham. 2005. "Alternative Pathways to Community and Economic Development: The Latrobe Valley Community Partnering Project." *Geographical Research* no. 43 (3):274-285.
- Capello, Roberta, and Peter Nijkamp. 2009. *Handbook of Regional Growth Theories*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Cavana, R. Y., & Sekaran, Uma., Delahaye, Brian L 2001. *Applied Business Research: Qualitative and Quantitative Methods*. New York: John Wiley and Sons Australia.

- Chell, Elizabeth , Katerina Nicolopoulou, and Mine Karatas-Ozkan. 2010. "Social Entrepreneurship and Enterprise: International and Innovation Perspectives". *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* no. 22 (6):485-493.
- Chilisa, Bagele. 2012. *Indigenous Research Methodologies*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Coule, Tracey., and Beth Patmore. 2013. "Institutional Logics, Institutional Work, and Public Service Innovation in Non-Profit Organizations". *Public Administration* no. 91 (4):980-997.
- Craig, David. 2003. "Reterritorialising health: inclusive partnerships, joined-up governance and common accountability platforms in Third Way New Zealand". *Policy and Politics* no. 31 (3): 335-352.
- Dacin, Peter, Jerry Goodstein, and Richard W. Scott. 2002. "Institutional Theory and Institutional Change: Introduction to the Special Research Forum". *Academy of Management Journal* no. 45 (1): 45-56
- Dalziel, Paul., Saunders, C., Fyfe, Rosie., & Newton, B. 2009. Sustainable Development and Cultural Capital (Vol. Official Statistics Research Series 6). Wellington: Official Statistics System.
- Dart, Raymond 2004. "The Legitimacy of Social Enterprise". *Nonprofit Management and Leadership* no. 14 (4):411-424
- David, Robert J., Wesley D. Sine, and Heather A. Haveman. 2013. "Seizing Opportunity in Emerging Fields: How Institutional Entrepreneurs Legitimated the Professional Form of Management Consulting". *Organization Science* no. 24 (2):356-377.
- Davidsson, Per , Leif Lindmark, and Christer Olofsson. 1994. "New Firm Formation and Regional Development in Sweden". *Regional Studies* no. 28 (4):395-410.
- de Bruin, Anne. 1999. "Towards Extending the Concept of Human Capital: A Note on Cultural Capital". *The Journal of Interdisciplinary Economics* no. 10: 59-70.
- de Bruin, A., & Dupis, A. (Eds.). 2003. *Entrepreneurship: New Perspectives in a Global Age* Hampshire Ashgate
- Defourny, Jacques , and Marthe Nyssens. 2006. "Defining Social Enterprise "In *Social Enterprise: At the Crossroads of Market, Public Policies and Civil Society*", edited by Marthe Nyssens, Sophie Adam and Toby Johnson, 3-26. New York Routledge
- Desa, Geoffrey. 2011. "Resource Mobilization in International Social Entrepreneurship: Bricolage as a Mechanism of Institutional Transformation". *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* no. 35 (1).
- Di Domenico, M., Haugh, H., & Tracey, P. 2010. "Social Bricolage: Theorizing Social Value Creation in Social Enterprises". *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* no. 34 (4): 681-703.
- DiMaggio, Paul. J., & Powell, Walter. W. 1983. "The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields". *American Sociological Review* no. 48 (2): 147-160.
- Dorado, Silvia, and Marc J Ventresca. 2013. "Crescive Entrepreneurship in Complex Social Problems: Institutional Conditions for Entrepreneurial Engagement". *Journal of Business Venturing* no. 28 (1):69-82.
- Eisenhardt, Kathleen 1989. "Building Theories from Case Study Research". *The Academy of Management Review* no. 14 (4):532-550.
- Evans, Mel, and Stephen Syrett. 2007. "Generating Social Capital? : The Social Economy and Local Economic Development". *European Urban and Regional Studies* no. 14 (1):55-74.
- Evers, Adalbert., & Schulze-Boeing, Matthias. 2001. Social Enterprises and Transitional Employment In C. Borzaga & J. Defourny (Eds.), *The Emergence of Social Enterprise*. London: Routledge.
- Eversole, Robyn., Jo Barraket., and Belinda Luke. 2013. "Social enterprises in rural community development". *Community Development Journal* no. 49 (2):245-261.
- Friedland, R. And R.R Alford. 1991. "Bringing Society Back in: Symbols, Practices and Institutional Contradictions", in W.W. Powell and P.J. DiMaggio (eds.), *Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*, Vol. 232-263. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fritsch, Michael., and Pamela Mueller. 2004. "Effects of New Business Formation on Regional Development Over Time". *Regional Studies* no. 38 (8):961-975.
- Foley, Dennis. 2003. "Indigenous Epistemology and Indigenous Standpoint Theory". *Social Alternatives* No. 22 (1):44-52.



- Fontana, Andrea., & Frey, James. 1998. Interviewing: The Art of Science in Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Qualitative Materials*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Galera, Giulia, and Carlo Borzaga. 2009. "Social Enterprise An International Overview of its Conceptual Evolution and Legal Implementation". *Social Enterprise Journal* no. 5 (3):210-228.
- Gibson-Graham, Julie, and Jenny Cameron. 2007. "Community Enterprises: Imagining and Enacting Alternatives to Capitalism". *Social Alternatives* no. 26 (1):20-25
- Greenman, Andrew. 2013. "Everyday Entrepreneurial Action and Cultural Embeddedness: An Institutional Logics Perspective". *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* no. 25 (7-8): 631-653.
- Greenwood, Royston., & Hinings, C. R. 1996. "Understanding Radical Organizational Change: Bringing Together the Old and the New Institutionalism". *The Academy of Management Review* no. 21 (4): 1022-1054.
- Greenwood, Royston., Oliver, Christine., Kerstin, Sahlin & Suddaby, Roy. (Eds.).2008. Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism. London, GBR: SAGE Publications Ltd. Retrieved from <http://www.ebrary.com>.
- Hadjimichalis, Costis., & Hudson, Ray. 2007. "Rethinking Local and Regional Development: Implications for Radical Political Practice in Europe". *European Urban and Regional Studies* no. 14 (2):99-113.
- Hervieux, Chantal., Gedajlovic, Eric., & Turcotte, Marie-France, B. 2010. "The Legitimization of Social Entrepreneurship". *Journal of Enterprising Communities* no. 40 (1):37-67.
- Hjorth, Daniel. 2013. "Public entrepreneurship: desiring social change, creating sociality". *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* no. 25(1-2): 34-51.
- Hudson, Ray. 2007. "Regions and Regional Uneven Development Forever? Some Reflective Comments upon Theory and Practice". *Regional Studies* no. 41 (9):1149-1160.
- Hudson, Ray. 2009. "Life on the Edge: Navigating The Competitive Tensions between the 'Social' and the 'Economy' in the Social Economy and in its Relations to the Mainstream". *Journal of Economic Geography* no. 9 (4):493-510.
- Hunter, Boyd .H. , and Matthew, Gray. 2012. Continuity and Change in the CDEP Scheme In *Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research Working Papers* Canberra The Australian National University
- Huybrechts, Benjamin., & Nicholls, Alex. 2013. "The Role of Legitimacy in Social Enterprise-Corporate Collaboration". *Social Enterprise Journal* no. 9 (2):130-146.
- Johnson, Louise. 2006. "Valuing the Arts: Theorising and Realising Cultural Capital in an Australian City." *Geographical Research* No. 44 (3):296-309.
- Keast, Robyn. L. 2011. "Joined-Up Governance in Australia: How the Past Can Inform the Future". *Journal of Public Administration* no. 34 (4):221-231.
- Keast, Robyn. L., & Mandell, M. 2014. "The collaborative push: moving beyond rhetoric and gaining evidence". *Journal of Management and Governance* no. 18 (1):9-28.
- Kerlin, Janelle. 2006. "Social Enterprise in the United States and Europe: Understanding and Learning from the Differences". *Voluntas* no. 17:247-263.
- Klein, Juan-Luis, Jean-Marc Fontan, and Diane-Gabrielle Tremblay. 2009. "Social Entrepreneurs, Local Initiatives and Social Economy: Foundations for a Socially Innovative Strategy to Fight Against Poverty and Exclusion". *Canadian Journal of Regional Science* no. XXXII (Spring ):23-42.
- Klein, Juan-Luis, Diane-Gabrielle Tremblay, and Denis Bussieres. 2010. "Social Economy-based Local Initiatives and Social Innovation: A Montreal Case Study". *International Journal of Technology Management* no. 51 (1):121-138.
- Lawrence, Thomas, B, and Phillips Nelson. 2004. "From Moby Dick to Free Willy: Macro-Cultural Discourse and Institutional Entrepreneurship in Emerging Institutional Fields". *Organization* no. 11 (5):389-711.
- Lehner, Othmar. M. 2014. "The formation and interplay of social capital in crowdfunded social ventures". *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* no. 26 (5-6): 478-499.

- Lin, Nan., Cook, Karen., & Burt, Ronald. 2001. *Social Capital Theory and Research*. New York: Aldine De Gruyter.
- Lorendahl, Bengt. 1996. "New Cooperatives and Local Development: A Study of Six Cases in Jamtland, Sweden". *Journal of Rural Studies* no. 12 (2):143-150
- Louis, Renee Paulani. 2007. "Can you Hear us Now? Voices from the Margin: Using Indigenous Methodologies in Geographic Research". *Geographical Research* no. 45 (2):130-139
- Lounsbury, Michael. 2007. "A Tale of Two Cities: Competing Logics and Practice Variation in the Professionalizing of Mutual Funds". *Academy of Management Journal* no. 50 (2): 289-307.
- Lounsbury, Michael., Marc Ventresca., and Hirsch, Paul. 2003. "Social Movements, Field Frames and Industry Emergence: A Cultural-Political Perspective on US Recycling." *Socio-Economic Review* no. 1 (1): 71-104.
- Luke, Belinda., Barraket, Jo., & Eversole, Robyn. 2013. "Measurement as Legitimacy Versus Legitimacy of Measures". *Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management* No. 10 (3/4): 234-258.
- Mair, Johanna, Ignasi Marti, and MJ Ventresca. 2012. "Building Inclusive Markets in Rural Bangladesh: How Intermediaries Work Institutional Voids". *Academy of Management Journal* no. 55 (4).
- Marquis, Christopher., and Lounsbury, Michael. 2007. "Vive La Resistance: Competing Logics and the Consolidation of U.S. Community Banking". *Academy of Management Journal* No. 50 (4): 799-820.
- Marquis, Christopher., & Lounsbury, Michael. 2011. "Community as an Institutional Order and a Type of Organizing" in *Research in the Sociology of Organizations, Volume 33: Communities and Institutional Innovation*. Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing.
- Martin, Karen. 2003. "Ways of Knowing, Ways of Being and Ways of Doing: A Theoretical Framework and Methods for Indigenous Research and Indigenist Research. Voicing Dissent, New Talents 21C: Next Generation Australian Studies". *Journal of Australian Studies* no. 27 (76):203-214.
- Mason, Chris , James Kirkbride, and David Bryde. 2007. "From Stakeholders to Institutions: The Changing Face of Social Enterprise Governance Theory". *Management Decision* no. 45 (2):284-301.
- Mawson, John. 2010. "Social Enterprise, Strategic Networks and Regional Development". *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy* no. 30 (1/2):66-83.
- McCall, Tony. 2003. "Institutional Design for Community Economic Development: Issues of Opportunity and Capacity." *Community Development Journal* no. 38 (2):96-108.
- McCarthy, Breda. 2012. "From Fishing Factories to Cultural Tourism: The Role of Social Entrepreneurs in the Construction of a new Insitutional Field." *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* no. 24 (3-4):259-282.
- McKeever, Edward., Anderson, Alistair., & Jack, Sarah. 2014. "Entrepreneurship and mutuality: social capital in processes and practices". *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* no. 26(5-6): 453-477.
- McLaughlin, Juliana. 2011. In Search for Authenticity and Decolonising Methodology: A Case Study of an Australian Aid Project for Papua New Guinea Education. Paper presented at the *British Educational Research Association Conference* Institute of Education London.
- Memmi, Albert. 1965. *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Meyskens, Moriah, Alan Carsrud, and Richard Cardozo. 2010. "The Symbiosis of Entities in the Social Engagement Network: The Role of Social Ventures." *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* no. 22 (5):425-455.
- Merriam, Sharan. B. 1998. *Qualitative Research and Case Study Applications in Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Milner, Richard. 2007. "Race, Culture and Researcher Positionality: Working Through Dangers Seen, Unseen and Unforeseen". *Educational Researcher* Vol. 36 (7):388-400.
- Moulaert, Frank, and Abid Mehmood. 2010. "Analysing Regional Development and Policy: A Structural-Realist Approach." *Regional Studies* no. 44 (1):103-118.
- Moulaert, Frank, and Farid Sekia. 2003. "Territorial Innovation Models: A Critical Survey". *Regional Studies* no. 37 (3):289-302.

- Nakata, Martin. 1997. *The Cultural Interface: An Exploration of the Intersection of Western Knowledge Systems and Torres Strait Islander Positions and Experiences*. Townsville: James Cook University.
- Ney, Steven., Beckmann, Markus., Graebnitz, Dorit and Mirkovic, Rastislava. 2014. "Social Entrepreneurs and Social Change: Tracing Impacts of Social Entrepreneurship Through Ideas, Structures and Practices". *Int. J. Entrepreneurial Venturing*, 6 (1): 51-68.
- Nicholls, Ruth. 2009. "Research and Indigenous Participation: Critical Reflexive Methods". *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* No. 12(2): 117-126.
- Nicholls, Alex. 2010. "Institutionalizing Social Entrepreneurship in Regulatory Space: Reporting and Disclosure by Community Interest Companies " *Accounting, Organizations and Society* no. 35 (4):394-415.
- O Riain, Sean. 2010. "Globalization and Regional Development." In *Handbook of Local and Regional Development*, edited by Andy Pike, Andres Rodriguez-Pose and John Tomaney. Hoboken: Taylor and Francis
- Onyx, Jenny, and Rosemary Leonard. 2010. "The Conversion of Social Capital into Community Development: An Intervention in Australia's Outback". *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* no. 34.2:381-97.
- Pache, Anne-Claire., and Filipe Santos. 2012. "Inside the Hybrid Organization: Selective Coupling as a Response to Competing Institutional Logics". *Academy of Management Journal* no. 56 (4): 972-1001.
- Padgett, Deborah. K. 1998. *Qualitative Methods in Social Work Research Challenges and Rewards*. London: Sage Publications.
- Pike, Andy , Andres Rodriguez-Pose, and John Tomaney. 2007. "What Kind of Local and Regional Development and for Whom?" *Regional Studies* no. 41 (9):1253-1269.
- Pope, Catherine., Ziebland, Sue., & Mays, Nicholas. 2000. "Qualitative Research in Health Care Analysing Qualitative Data". *British Medical Journal* No. 320 (7227):114-116.
- Porter, Michael.E. 2000. "Location, Competition, and Economic Development: Local Clusters in a Global Economy". *Economic Development Quarterly* no. 14 (1):15-34.
- Pritchard, Bill., & McManus, Phil. 2000. *Land of Discontent The Dynamics of Change in Rural and Regional Australia*. Sydney: UNSW Press.
- Putnam, Robert, D. 1993. "The Prosperous Community". *The American Prospect* no. 4 (13).
- Rao, Hayagreeva, Calvin Morrill, and Mayer, Zald. 2000. *Power Plays: How Social Movements and Collective Action Create New Organizational Forms* Edited by BM Staw and RJ Sutton. Vol. 22, *Research in Organizational Behavior* New York Elsevier.
- Reay, Trish., & Hinings, C. R. 2009. "Managing the Rivalry of Competing Institutional Logics". *Organization Studies* no. 30(6): 629-652.
- Rhodes, R. A. W. 2007. "Understanding Governance: Ten Years On". *Organization Studies* no. 28 (8):1243-1264.
- Rodriguez-Pose, Andres. 2013. "Do Institutions Matter for Regional Development". *Regional Studies* no. 47 (7): 1034-1047.
- Ruebottom, Trish. 2013. "The Microstructures of Rhetorical Strategy in Social Entrepreneurship: Building Legitimacy Through Heroes and Villians". *Journal of Business Venturing* no. 28 (1): 98-116.
- Saz-Carranza, Angel., & Longo, Francisco. 2012. "Managing Competing Institutional Logics in Public-Private Joint Ventures". *Public Management Review* no. 14 (3): 331-357.
- Scott, Richard. W. 2008. "Approaching Adulthood: The Maturing of Institutional Theory". *Theory and Society* no. 37 (5): 427-442.
- Smith, Brett R. , and Christopher E. Stevens. 2010. "Different Types of Social Entrepreneurship: The role of Geography and Emeddedness on the Measurement and Scaling of Social Value". *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* no. 22 (6):575-598.
- Smith, Linda. 1999. Chapter 3: Colonising Knowledge In L. Smith (Ed.), *Decolonizing Methodolgies: Research and indigenous peoples* (pp. 58-72). London: Zed Books.

- Sonnino, Roberta, and Christopher Griggs-Trevarthen. 2013. "A Resilient Social Economy? Insights from the Community Food Sector in the UK". *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* no. 25 (3-4):272-292.
- Squazzoni, Flaminio. 2009. "Social Entrepreneurship and Economic Development in Silicon Valley: A Case Study on the Joint Venture: Silicon Valley Network". *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* no. 35 (5):869-883.
- Storper, Michael. 1995. "The Resurgence of Regional Economies, Ten Years Later: The Region as a Nexus of Untraded Interdependencies". *European Urban and Regional Studies* no. 2:191-221.
- Suddaby, Roy. 2010. "Challenges for Institutional Theory". *Journal of Management Inquiry* no. 19 (1): 14-20
- Suchman, Mark. 1995. "Managing Legitimacy: Strategic and Institutional Approaches". *Academy of Management Review*, no. 20 (3): 571-610.
- Svendsen, Gunnar Lind Haase , and Gert Tinggaard Svendsen. 2004. *The Creation and Destruction of Social Capital* Cheltenham, UK Edward Elgar
- Teasdale, Simon. 2010. "How can Social Enterprise Address Disadvantage? Evidence from an Inner City Community". *Journal of Nonprofit and Public Sector marketing* no. 22:89-107.
- Terluin, Ida J. 2003. "Differences in Economic Development in Rural Regions of Advanced Countries: An Overview and Critical Analysis of Theories." *Journal of Rural Studies* no. 19:327-344.
- Thornton, Patricia. H. 2002. "The Rise of the Corporation in a Craft Industry: Conflict and Conformity in Institutional Logics". *The Academy of Management Journal* no. 25 (1): 81-101.
- Thornton, Patricia. H., & Ocasio, William. 2008. Institutional Logics. *The Sage Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism*. London: Sage.
- Thornton, Patricia, William Ocasio and Michael Lounsbury. 2012. *The Institutional Logics Perspective: A New Approach to Culture, Structure and Process*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Tonts, Matthew , and Fiona Haslam-McKenzie. 2005. "Neoliberalism and Changing Regional Policy in Australia". *International Planning Studies* no. 10 (3-4):183-200.
- Vinson, Tony , Margot Rawsthorne, and Brian Cooper. 2001. Dropping Off the Edge: The Distribution of Disadvantage in Australia Adelaide Catholic Social Services Australia.
- Vurro, Clodia., Dacin, Tina M., & Perrini, Francesco. 2010. "Institutional Antecedents of Partnering for Social Change: How Institutional Logics Shape Cross-Sector Social Partnerships". *Journal of Business Ethics* no. 94 (1): 39-53.
- Walker, Polly. 2003. "Colonising Research: Academia's Structural Violence Towards Indigenous People". *Social Alternatives* Vol. 22 (3):37-40.
- Wilson, Shawn. 2001. "What is indigenous Research Methodology?" *Canadian Journal of Native Education* no. 25 (2):175-181.

## Appendix 1. List of all research participants

| REGION ONE                                 |                                 |       |
|--|---------------------------------|-------|
| SE 1                                       | Coding                          | Total |
| 1  | Manager 1, SE A                 | 3     |
| 1  | Employee 1, SE A                |       |
| 1  | Employee 2, SE A                |       |
| SE 2                                       | Coding                          |       |
| 1  | Manager 1, SE B                 | 4     |
| 1  | Manager 2, SE B                 |       |
| 1  | Employee 1, SE B                |       |
| 1  | Employee 2, SE B                |       |
| SE 3                                       | Coding                          |       |
| 1  | Manager 1, SE C                 | 3     |
| 1  | Employee 1, SE C                |       |
| 1  | Employee 2, SE C                |       |
| SE 4                                       | Coding                          |       |
| 1  | Manager 1, SE D                 | 6     |
| 1  | Manager 2, SE D                 |       |
| 1  | Volunteer 1, SE D               |       |
| 1  | Volunteer 2, SE D               |       |
| 1  | Volunteer 3, SE D               |       |
| 1  | Beneficiary 1, SE D             |       |
| SE 5                                       | Coding                          |       |
| 1  | Manager 1, SE E                 | 4     |
| 1  | Employee 1, SE E                |       |
| 1  | Beneficiary 1, SE E             |       |
| 1  | Beneficiary 2, SE E             |       |
| SE 6                                       | Coding                          |       |
| 1  | CEO 1, SE F                     | 3     |
| 1  | Manager 1, SE F                 |       |
| 1  | Employee 1, SE F                |       |
| Reps of Community Orgs                     | Coding                          |       |
| 1  | Rep of Community Organisation 1 | 4     |
| 1  | Rep of Community Organisation 2 |       |
| 1  | Rep of Community Organisation 3 |       |
| 1  | Rep of Community Organisation 4 |       |
| Rep of Government Org                      | Coding                          |       |
| 1  | Rep Govt Dept 1                 | 3     |
| 1  | Rep of Govt Dept 2              |       |
| 1  | Rep of Govt Dept 3              |       |
| Rep of local business                      | Coding                          |       |
| 1  | Rep of local business 1         | 3     |
| 2  | Rep of local business 2         |       |
| 3  | Rep of local business 3         |       |
| Total Number of Participants in Region One |                                 | 33    |

| REGION TWO   |                                   |           |
|--|-----------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>SE 1</b>  | <b>Coding</b>                     |           |
| 1  | Manager 1, SE A                   | 11        |
| 1  | Manager 2, SE A                   |           |
| 1  | Manager 3, SE A                   |           |
| 1  | Employee 1, SE A                  |           |
| 1  | Employee 2, SE A                  |           |
| 1  | Employee 3, SE A                  |           |
| 5  | Focus Group 1, SE A x5 Employees  |           |
| <b>SE 2</b>  | <b>Coding</b>                     |           |
| 1  | Manager 1, SE B                   | 14        |
| 1  | Employee 1, SE B                  |           |
| 1  | Employee 2, SE B                  |           |
| 1  | Employee 3, SE B                  |           |
| 5  | Focus Group 1, SE B x5 Employees  |           |
| 5  | Focus Group 2, SE B x 5 Employees |           |
| <b>SE 3</b>  | <b>Coding</b>                     |           |
| 1  | Manager 1, SE C                   | 2         |
| 1  | Employee 1, SE C                  |           |
| <b>SE 4</b>  | <b>Coding</b>                     |           |
| 1  | Manager 1, SE D                   | 4         |
| 1  | Employee 1, SE D                  |           |
| 1  | Employee 2, SE D                  |           |
| 1  | Employee 3, SE D                  |           |
| <b>Rep of Community Org</b>                            | <b>Coding</b>                     |           |
| 1  | Rep of Community Org 1            | 1         |
| <b>Rep of Govt</b>                                     | <b>Coding</b>                     |           |
| 1  | Rep of Govt Org 1                 | 1         |
| 1  | Rep of Govt Org 2                 | 1         |
| 1  | Rep of Govt Org 3                 | 1         |
| 1  | Rep of Govt Org 4                 | 1         |
| <b>Rep of Local Business</b>                           | <b>Coding</b>                     |           |
|  | Rep of local Business             | 1         |
| <b>Total Number of Participants in Region Two</b>      |                                   | <b>37</b> |
| <b>Total Number of Participants Region One and Two</b> |                                   | <b>70</b> |

## **Appendix 2. Example interview protocol for representatives of social enterprise and representatives of government organisations**

### **Protocol B**

#### **Representatives of Social Enterprise (SE Managers/Employees/Board Members/Volunteers)**

##### **General Questions**

1. Do you live in this region?
  - a. Do you work in this region?
  - b. How long have you lived/worked in this region?
2. What are the main challenges that face this region?
3. What are the main opportunities that face this region?
4. How was the SE started?
  - a. Who started the SE? What was involved?
5. What is your role within the SE?
  - a. Please describe your main responsibilities
  - b. How long have you been involved with the SE?
6. How do you perceive regional development in this area?
  - a. What would regional development look like? Socially? Economically?
  - b. Who is responsible for regional development?

##### **Resource Capital**

1. What resources are particularly important for the SE to operate?
  - a. Examples include technology, finance, building and office space
2. Are there resources that are particularly scarce or abundant?
3. How is the SE financed?
4. What are the goals for this SE?
  - a. Are there plans for growth/sustainability? What would this look like?
  - b. What resources do you need to fulfil this plan?

##### **Institutional Capital**

1. What systems or management practices do you need or have in place internally that assists you to fulfil your mission?
  - a. Are there human resource plans and development?
  - b. How are business plans/decisions communicated?
  - c. What are the key systems that keep the SE operating?
2. What systems or relationships do you have externally that assist you to fulfil your mission?
  - a. Who do you consult for resources or advice?
  - b. How do you maintain these relationships?
3. Are there training opportunities for staff members and volunteers?
  - a. If so, how often are these offered?
  - b. Are there constraints to offering training?
4. Are there incentives and rewards for staff or volunteers?
  - a. What are people encouraged or rewarded for?
5. What is your perception of the broadband developments in regional Australia?
6. How do you gather community or government support for the SE?
7. Do you share resources or information with other organisations or government?
  - a. Why do you share resources/information?
  - b. Are there barriers to sharing resources/Information?

##### **Social Capital**

1. How would you describe the level of trust within the organisation?
  - a. How important is trust?
  - b. How is this created within the organisation and maintained?
2. How would you describe the level of trust with other community groups within the community?
  - a. Do you trust other community groups or SE?
  - b. Why?

3. Do you consult with govt or consultants for advice on the operation or the SE?
4. Have there been any difficulties with accessing advice or resources from government or consultants?

#### **Resource Outputs**

1. Are there any resources that the SE produces which have assisted you to fulfil your mission?
2. What do you see are the main contributions of the SE to the community?
  - a. Who are the main beneficiaries of your work?
3. Are there other contributions you would like to see however, are currently restrained?
4. Does the SE measure its impact or outputs?
  - a. If not, what constraints hinder this? (knowledge, financial, time)
  - b. If so, how often and how does this happen?
  - c. Who do the results get reported to?
  - d. What is the reason behind measuring impact?

#### **Institutional Outputs**

1. Please describe your relationship with government (positive/negative?)
2. How would you describe your relationship with other community groups?
3. Are there any ways in which you wish to change/improve these relationships?

#### **Economic Outputs**

1. Do you source resources or advice from other SE or community organisations?
  - a. Why is this important?
  - b. How often are you in contact with them?
2. What do you perceive are the economic outputs of the SE for the community?
  - a. For example employment creation/reinvestment back into the community?

### **Protocol C**

#### **Government Employees/Representatives of Community Organisations**

#### **General Questions**

1. Do you live in this region?
  - c. Do you work in this region?
  - d. How long have you lived/worked in this region?
2. In your opinion, what are the main challenges that face this region?
3. In your opinion, what are the main opportunities that face this region?
4. What is the role of the department?
  - a. What is your role within the department?
  - b. Please describe your responsibilities
  - c. How long have you worked for the department?
5. How do you perceive regional development in this area?
  - a. What would regional development look like? Socially? Economically?
  - b. In your opinion, who is responsible for regional development?
  - c.

#### **Resource Capital**

1. Why is your department involved with the SE?
  - a. Does your department provide advice or financial support for the SE?
  - b. What is your role in facilitating this?
2. How long has the department been involved with the SE?
  - a. How long have you been involved with the SE in your role?

#### **Institutional Capital**

1. Please describe your relationship with the SE?
2. How often do you engage with the SE?
3. Are there any barriers within or external to your organisation that hinders your involvement with the SE?

#### **Social Capital**

1. How would you describe the level of trust between you and the SE?



2. How did the department's relationship start with the SE?

**Resource Outputs**

1. What do you see are the main benefits of the SE for the community?

**Institutional Outputs**

1. Do you engage with other community organisation within the community
  - a. Is this different to how you engage with the SE?

**Social Outputs**

1. Do you perceive any social outputs of the SE for the community?

**Economic Outputs**

1. Do you perceive any economic outputs of the SE for the community?